

## REMARKS

The Examiner found Applicant's previous amendment submitted on June 30, 2003 improper as failing to show all the changes made to the claims, i.e., additions and/or deletions. The Examiner is correct. The Applicant failed to take into account that the amendments submitted March 4, 2003 were entered when the request for continued examination was submitted on April 3, 2003. Accordingly, the Applicant has properly amended claims 1, 2 and 4 in this response based on the claims of the response submitted on March 4, 2003 and to conform those claims to the claims as submitted on July 3, 2003.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 4-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Examiner relied upon the combination of Blaine U.S. Patent No. 6,572,878 (hereinafter Blaine) and Tankovich U.S. Patent No. 5,897,549 (hereinafter Tankovich) to support this rejection. The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Examiner relied on Blaine, Tankovich and Kushner U.S. Patent No. 5,741,509 (hereinafter Kushner) to support this rejection. However, Blaine is not prior art to the present application, which claims priority to a provisional application serial number 60/063,754, filed on October 17, 1997. Accordingly, Blaine cannot form the basis for any rejection of the present application. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1, 2 and 4-12 are in condition for further favorable consideration, culminating in allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard D. Conard  
Registration No. 27,321  
Attorney for Applicant

(317) 231-7285  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204  
INDS02 GKELETT 627861v1